Attorney Docket No.: Q66574

Application No.: 10/026,433

## REMARKS

This Amendment, filed in reply to the Office Action dated June 4, 2007, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-4, 6, 8, 9, 11-24 and 26-29 are all the claims pending in the application.

## I. Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claims 2, 3 and 14 for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. To expedite prosecution of this case, Applicant cancels claims 2, 3 and 14

## II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 2-4, 6, 9/6 and 11-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Shimura (U.S. Patent No. 5,301,107).

## III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 24 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimura in view of Andrews et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,449,195).

Claim 27 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Shimura under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over the combination of Shimura and Sones.

Claims 8, 9/8/26, 9/26, 21, 22, 23 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over the combination of Shimura, Sones and Andrews.

Claims 28 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over combination of Shimura and Sones.

As amended, claims 6 and 13 describe that an energy subtraction means performs subtraction using common parameters for both the first and the second energy subtraction as applied to the corrected image signals. The Examiner appears to concede that Shimura fails to

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 Attorney Docket No.: Q66574

Application No.: 10/026,433

each using common coefficients between subtractions and admits that different coefficients are used in the cited art. Therefore, Applicant would submit that claims 6 and 13 are patentable and claims 5, 8-9, 11-12, 15-24 and 27 are patentable based on their dependency.

With further regard to the rejection of independent claims 26 and 28, Applicant traverses the rejections as follows without further amendment of the claims.

Claim 26 describes that the first and second energy subtractions means are physically separated. The Examiner correctly concedes that Shimura does not teach this feature but cites Sones to make up for this deficiency. Office Action, page 19, lines 11-15. Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection is not supported for at least the following reason.

Even assuming *arguendo* that Shimura and Sones may be properly combined, the combination of Shimura and Sones does not teach or require that <u>subtraction</u> processings are physically separated. As the Examiner recognizes, Sones teaches separate <u>filter</u> means for bone and soft tissue. This would only lead to a separation of <u>filtering</u> elements but does not necessitate the physical separation of first and second <u>subtraction</u> elements. The subtraction may still be performed in common apparatus and still take into account the filter for the bone and tissue samples. By the Examiner's own logic, a common processor Shimura can have weight adjustments to make the first and second subtractions. Office Action, page 3, lines 1-8.

Therefore, the Examiner's rejection of claim 26 is not supported.

Claim 28 is patentable for reasons analogous to that set forth above for claim 26.

Applicant adds claims 30-34 to describe features of the invention more particularly.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 Attorney Docket No.: Q66574

Application No.: 10/026,433

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Registration No. 41,239

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC

Telephone: (202) 293-7060

Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE 23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 4, 2007